

in particular, are indeed trying to cooperate and do their best job. But there are big problems in Mexico's structure. We have known about that for some time and we know that many of the states of Mexico, like the States of the United States, have corruption in the state governments; that the police in those states are often involved with narcotics trafficking. We do not know to what degree, but it is a fairly high percentage.

There are going to have to be some structural, systemic reforms in Mexico that are going to take a number of years to accomplish. But the Mexican Government has recently passed new money-laundering laws and made extradition agreements with the United States. We will now see some people come out to be tried in the United States who are drug lords. The military in Mexico is destroying poppy crops in the mountain ranges where they do grow black tar heroin, which is a large part of the heroin in the western United States.

But Mexico does not grow a single bit of cocaine. There is no coca plant in Mexico. No refineries of cocaine in Mexico. And the biggest single group of drug problems that I hear about are problems related to cocaine and heroin, the two of them combined.

There is no reason why one extra ounce of cocaine should be allowed to get to Mexico to be distributed here by their drug lords. That is what is happening now. The Mexicans, these drug lords in Mexico are the ones who are doing the retailing in the United States, at least the western half. The Colombians take their cocaine to Mexico and wholesale it to the Mexicans and the Mexicans retail it here.

Our borders are porous. We need to continue to beef up our Southwest border and we are doing a decent job, but not doing nearly enough. It is not smart in many ways.

When we start looking at prioritization of putting our resources, the best use of our resources to really stop the flow of drugs into the United States is to put it before and below Mexico. Stop the drugs from ever getting to Mexico in the first place. The problems of Mexico are going to be around for a while. We need to work those problems. We do have the cooperation of the President and the Attorney General. Progress is being made. But we have to recognize that it is going to take a while, and if we are going to stop the flow of 80 percent of the drugs coming into this Nation in the next 3 years, which is possible to do, the place to do it is to draw that line south of Mexico and to make it work and to provide the resources that are necessary.

Mr. Speaker, let me wrap up by saying that again we need a balanced approach in fighting narcotics. We need to have a true war on drugs, though. We need to work on the supply side and the demand side. While my conversation today has been about the supply

side, we need to put emphasis as well equally on the demand side to get our young people better educated.

But today teenage drug use in the United States is double what it was in 1992. Double what it was. That is absolutely intolerable. It is unacceptable and we should be ashamed of it. Not only should we be ashamed, but we should be out there using every ounce of strength to destroy the pathways of those drugs getting to our young people.

Unless we reduce the quantity of drugs coming into the United States by at least 60 to 80 percent, we cannot drive the price of drugs up that are really cheap today in our cities and reduce the quantity to a manageable level, so that our local law enforcement can really be meaningful in its job and so that our local community leaders can be meaningful and get real results in their education and treatment efforts.

We have to reduce the onslaught of this overwhelming amount of narcotics coming in here, particularly cocaine and heroin from South America. The way to do that is to set that target and set a goal that is realistic and achievable.

I have suggested today that that be a target of 3 years to reduce by 80 percent the amount of drugs coming into the United States. It is a target that every one of our antinarcotics in-country team believes, in the three principal countries involved, that is Colombia, Peru and Bolivia. And it is something that this administration has yet to embrace in this strategy.

We as a Congress need to embrace that strategy. We need to force the resources, if necessary, on this administration to do the job. It can be done. It must be done. We need to provide those resources to those who can do it for us in the State Department, in the Defense Department, in the Justice Department with DEA, and in every other way that is necessary in those source countries where this is affecting.

The leaders in Colombia, Bolivia, and Peru at the very top of their governments are ready, willing and able now to cooperate. We better take advantage of it while we have the opportunity to stop the scourge of drugs affecting our young people. Let us go and give them the resources they need.

It is a first step. It is a logical step. It is not a 10-year plan; it is a 3-year plan. And I challenge my colleagues to join with me in an effort to really have a true, for the first time in our history, true war on drugs.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because it was just a few weeks ago that the President of the United

States in this very chamber said that we ought to reserve every dollar, every penny of a budgetary surplus and put it into Social Security. What was interesting about that to me is that basically what he was talking about, what he was outlining was the larger question of how we are going to save Social Security. In other words, if we take every penny of surplus and put that money where it belongs, which is in the Social Security Trust Fund, rather than borrowing from it, what we have done is we have taken a first step towards saving Social Security. But what that does, because of the way the budget works in Washington, D.C., what that would actually mean would be a pay-down of the national debt, which would be very good for Social Security, but again only a first step. To me what it raises is that larger question of how in fact do we save Social Security.

Some people have said, yes, it is a good first step to put every dollar of Social Security tax into the Social Security Trust Fund, but the larger question is, since that does not affect the 70 million baby-boomers that begin retiring in 2012, and since that is ultimately what we have to deal with, what we ought to do is look at cutting current benefits for current retirees.

I do not think that that is at all a realistic option. When I talk to seniors along the coast of Myrtle Beach, along the coast of South Carolina, what they say to me is the idea of cutting current benefits is crazy, that Social Security is very important to each of their lives, and that that is not the way you are going to save Social Security.

Other people have said, do you know what you ought to do is, you ought to raise payroll taxes on young people. And yet overwhelmingly what I hear from people across my district at home in South Carolina is that that is not a realistic idea, that you can only squeeze but so much blood from a turnip. And what they are saying is that they are squeezed. They are struggling to make a mortgage payment, to make a car payment, to provide for dollars for kids' education, and that the idea raising the payroll tax just is not the way to do it.

Other people say the way we ought to look at saving Social Security is by freezing it. In other words, we ought to just fossilize it, leave it alone. We do not touch it. We leave it in a corner. Well, that would be nice. It is something I wish we could do. But the fact, again, is that we have got 70 million baby-boomers that start to retire in 2012. That is no fault of the designers of Social Security. It is no fault of anybody in the past, but is something that is coming our way, and we ought to, rather than simply freezing and looking at the problem coming in our direction, do something about it, which is what the President of the United States had said in the first step being let us reserve every dollar surplus towards Social Security.

I think the bigger question, if we are not going to cut current benefits,

which is not an option, if we are not going to raise payroll taxes, which is not an option, and if we are not going to freeze, standing in the corner, sort of fossilizing it the way the dinosaurs went, that only leaves one other option for saving Social Security. This other option I think ties straight back to what Senator BOB KERREY, over on the Senate side, a Democrat, is talking about. He says, you have got to have a real rate of return, a real return on assets, if we are going to save Social Security over the next 50 years.

We cannot save Social Security by having it offered to young people today at a suboptimal return. If it is only going to return to them a negative rate of return or a 1 percent rate of return over the course of their lives, we can be assured that Social Security as we know it will disappear over the next 150 years because the consensus in America is not going to be for a sustained rate of return of zero or 1 percent. So I think that the only option in saving Social Security is letting one earn more on their Social Security investment.

The trustees have said, if we do nothing, Social Security begins to run shortfalls in 2012, it begins to run, basically run out of money in 2029; that the average rate of return for everybody working and paying into the system is about 1.9 percent; and that for people born after 1940, the rate of return is actually negative. Now, if you earn a negative rate of return, or if you earn a 1 percent rate of return, you do not end up with a whole lot at the end of the one's working lifetime.

This idea of rate of return is very, very powerful in people's lives. If you take two 20,000-per-year workers, in other words, one fellow earns 20,000 and another fellow earns 20,000, they both go to work at exactly the same age, say they begin work at age 25, and they work until they are 65. If one earns 1.9 percent on your rate of return based on present Social Security taxes, you end up with \$175,000 in the bank.

#### WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this afternoon, I expect to be joined by other women Members of Congress. I have already been joined by my distinguished cochair of the women's caucus here in the Congress, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON). We have come because this is a special month. It is called women's history month. We who are Members of Congress are not historians, however. While we exalt in women's special history in this country and acknowledge the need to use this month to make Americans more aware of the vital role that women have played in the coun-

try's history, we have an additional obligation, we who serve in the Congress, and that is to keep people current on what it is that this Congress is doing for women and for families. For now 21 years the women's caucus has taken as its special obligation to secure the rights and needs of women and their families.

I am going to say something about the work of the women's caucus because I believe that much of that work is done behind the scenes and women's history month is a good point to let Members and others know of the history that is being made in this body for women and for families. Before I am through, indeed in just a few minutes, I am going to hand it off to my cochair, the Republican cochair of the caucus, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON), and then I will come back to say something further.

Last year was a landmark year for the women in Congress. We are 50 strong now. We know that that is nothing to write home about if you consider that there are 440 Members of this body, but it does mean that there has been progress in this body since there was hardly a woman to be found among the Members. And that was the case 21 years ago.

Last year in celebrating our 20th anniversary, we had the first dinner we have ever had because we thought when you get to be 20 years old, you ought to do something special, and we had that in a beautiful Federal building downtown, a historic structure. President Clinton, First Lady Hillary Clinton, both attended the dinner and spoke, and the first woman ever to be Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright, was the featured speaker, and because women like to have fun, Sweet Honey in the Rock came to sing for the women and men who were gathered there.

What we do most of the time, however, is not to celebrate. What we do most of the time is to fix upon some priorities from among the many that confront the country every year affecting women and families. Mrs. JOHNSON and I thought that on the 20th anniversary of the caucus, we ought to look at the great progress we have made and think about how we should proceed in the future.

We looked at what milestones had been accomplished. I have to tell Members, without detailing all of them during the time we have this afternoon, that they are most impressive, 20 years of concrete achievements.

To give you just a feel, a few examples. Women in Congress are particularly proud of what we have done for women's health. Women's health was a submerged and neglected field when the women's caucus was born. Today, however, women's health is an issue that women and men in this body can take real pride in. Women are now included in clinical trials. Women had the great neglected conditions, but now osteoporosis and breast cancer are

among the conditions that the Congress has given a particular time and attention to.

We are beginning to focus on a real sleeper issue in women's health. If I were to ask the average person what kills more women than any other condition, there would probably be some conditions in the cancer category that people would come forward with because there is so much said about this disease. But the fact is that it is heart disease that kills most women. We need to look closely at heart disease in women to see what it has in common and how it is different from heart disease in men.

Beyond health, and there are a dozen conditions and avenues in health that the women's caucus has brought alive in its 20 years, but I would also cite the Family Medical and Leave Act. This opportunity for people to take uncompensated time off for a serious health need has been a godsend to hundreds of thousands of families already, and it was just signed in 1992. It is a landmark piece of legislation. It leaves us behind most industrialized countries because most industrialized countries give some form of compensated leave for family and medical needs, but we are getting there.

There is, of course, the Pregnancy Discrimination Act, to name another of the great achievements of the women's caucus. When I was having my children, pregnancy was not even covered by health insurance plans, and if it was covered at all, it was covered in a very small amount compared to other conditions. A woman could be dismissed because of pregnancy. This, of course, was discrimination based on pregnancy, and I was Chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission at a time when we believed that pregnancy discrimination was, of course, covered by title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. A decision from the Supreme Court interpreted title VII not to cover pregnancy, however, and it fell to this body to make it clear that title VII should cover pregnancy, and the landmark Pregnancy Discrimination Act was passed. There is no question that women's ability to move as they now must in the workplace would have been severely hindered without the work of this body on the Pregnancy Discrimination Act.

If I could name just one more among many pieces of legislation that are hallmarks of the 20 years of women in the Congress, the Domestic Violence Act, this is another piece of legislation that it took years to enact, but which everyone now embraces as a landmark act. Domestic violence crosses all manner of boundaries in our society, and women have been left without help or assistance, with the focus of the Congress on criminal violence. This body opened itself to understanding that some of the worst violence occurs inside the home, and that more women are murdered by partners and husbands than by strangers. And so the Domestic Violence Act was passed.